

**★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ news release**

On July 1, the new Division of Wildlife Services came into being as a successor to the Division of Predator and Rodent Control. A new Division Chief was appointed -- Jack H. Berryman, formerly an Associate Professor of Wildlife Resources at Utah State University.

In the intervening six months a reorganization and reorientation of the Division have been taking place and we are now at a point where we can discuss, with some certainty, the course we will be following.

First, let us discuss the Leopold Report and what it really means, since there are some apparent misunderstandings by both the resource users and the protectionist groups.

The Secretary's Wildlife Management Advisory Board was assigned by the Department of the Interior to study the animal control activities of the Department, and to make recommendations for improvement. The Board made no drastic recommendations. What it really did was to consolidate and crystallize thinking that had become current and bring these thoughts together into a useful set of recommendations.

The Board recommended the appointment of an advisory board on predator and rodent control; a reassessment by the Bureau of the goals of its predator and rodent control activity; the development of rigid criteria for determining when and where there is a need for conducting animal control; a greatly amplified research program; a new name for Predator and Rodent Control; and, legal controls over the use of poisons. It generally recommended a complete reassessment of the goals, policies and field operations of the Division of Predator and Rodent Control, with a view to limiting the killing program strictly to cases of proven need, as determined by rigidly prescribed criteria.

The work of the Board crystallized and condensed the thoughts of many within and outside of the Bureau. It was time for some change, and the Leopold Report, in effect, became the instrument for that change.

The Leopold Report was accepted by Secretary Udall as a "general guidepost for Department policy ..." Note that the report was accepted as a guidepost, not as a policy mandate. This is an important distinction -- not because the report does not contain many worthwhile suggestions and recommendations, but because it is not the working manual for the Bureau, as many have supposed.

In accepting the report, Secretary Udall stated that:

"We have no intention of abandoning our responsibility in the control of damage ... when it is clear that the Department's assistance is needed ...," and that "... the Department is not planning any abrupt program changes which would create a void in needed pest control." And "... at the same time, the Department has a much wider interest in wildlife, including the general public interest and special interest in rare and endangered species."

He explained that, "The problems of today must be met with an ecological approach, based upon the husbandry of all wildlife. This includes even those species which, at certain times and places are either misplaced by land use or are concentrated in such numbers as to be regarded as pests."

Secretary Udall pointed out that the Department will insist that all damage-control efforts in which it participates be effective, efficient, and the minimum required to meet demonstrated needs and that there will be increased emphasis on both research and the gathering of data on damage.

It is within the framework of this broad policy statement that we are now working -- it is this broad policy that we have begun to implement.

One of the recommendations of the Leopold Committee was a new name for the Division of Predator and Rodent Control. On July 1, 1965, this Division was replaced by a new Division of Wildlife Services. This was far more than a simple change in name. It was the establishment of a new division, with added responsibilities, intended to improve conditions for other wildlife resources.

As now constituted, the new Division will have responsibility for the animal control activities of the Bureau and also will engage in wildlife resource enhancement work and pesticide surveillance and monitoring.

In wildlife enhancement, technical assistance will be made available to improve conditions for wildlife, especially migratory species, with initial emphasis on Federal and Indian lands.

The pesticides program will carry out the Bureau's responsibility for protecting wildlife and its habitat from unnecessary adverse effects that might result from specific chemical pest control projects in the field, especially on Interior lands. It also will periodically sample selected species of wildlife throughout the Nation to aid in the National plan for keeping track of long-term changes in pesticides residues in the environment.

Along with the change in the name of the Division, the working titles of all Division personnel were changed, effective August 1, coincidental with the effective date of the reorganization plan for the entire Bureau.

Since creation of the new Division, the Bureau has been carefully evaluating all of the suggestions and recommendations contained in the Leopold Report along with suggestions and recommendations received from

other sources. We have been implementing those for which the Bureau and the Federal government have responsibility just as rapidly as is practical and possible.

It must be borne in mind that the Leopold Committee did not confine its study simply to Bureau or Department activities; there are many suggestions and recommendations that cannot be put into effect by the Department of the Interior, but rather are expected of other agencies, organizations, and institutions.

The most important undertaking during the past six months has been the development of a new animal control policy which is now in preliminary draft form.

Let me digress for a moment, however, and discuss philosophy, since evolution and development of philosophy must precede the statement of policy.

When this continent was colonized, the wilderness was a challenge. It had to be tamed and rolled back. Some of the animals of that wilderness were valuable for food and fiber, while others posed a direct threat to man. As resources were exploited, wild creatures were killed for food and other purposes.

We are now passing through a period of reorientation and our wildlife resources are being viewed in a different perspective. As we move into an even more complex, mobile, and densely populated civilization, we find a general recognition that wildlife resources must be managed for scientific, social, and esthetic, as well as economic values. There is a recognition that while the control of animals is necessary, it must be practiced on a sophisticated basis, with scientific finesse and with full regard for the impact on the total environment.

With changing social values, the language of the past is archaic and no longer acceptable or appropriate. Except where required by legal terminology, the Bureau will no longer categorize animals as "pests," "beneficial species," "injurious species," "predators," or as "good" or "bad." Any species or any individual animal may be "good" or "bad" under different circumstances, or both good and bad at the same time, depending upon the situation. Each species, therefore, must be considered under the circumstances that prevail at any given time and place.

In pursuing our animal control responsibilities, we recognize natural ecological relationships. At the same time, we clearly recognize that man now lives in a synthetic and increasingly competitive environment. This is an environment modified by urbanization; by modern highway systems; by the development of a system of airports;

by intensive agricultural development; by extensive range and forest environmental manipulation; by the use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals; and by a host of other activities that have a direct impact upon wildlife resources.

This impact, in many instances, has been detrimental. On the other hand, man's activities in manipulating the environment have enhanced conditions for certain forms of wildlife and some of these have, in turn, reacted in ways we find unfavorable. Reforestation and range restoration activities result in problems with rodents, requiring that these animals be controlled to permit the successful completion of a worthwhile resource management undertaking.

Intensive agricultural practices have improved conditions for blackbirds and starlings, bringing about an increase in those and other birds to the point where control measures are necessary to prevent undue losses to standing crops.

The development of sanitary landfills, harbor facilities, and airports have improved conditions for gulls and other shorebirds, attracting these in numbers that, in some cases, threaten man's safety, as evidenced by the increasing number of aircraft striking birds. These have resulted in many near-accidents, and in some accidents that have caused human deaths.

The establishment and maintenance of a livestock industry here in the West brings the husbandry of domesticated animals into conflict with wild animals that, by their very nature, prey upon plant-eating animals, including sheep and cattle. Under these and other circumstances, animal control is a very necessary resource management tool.

Animal control techniques vary from the simple repelling device to the extremely lethal toxic agent. They are used on private and public lands -- in the country and in the city, and for many reasons. Considering this, the Bureau holds that when animal control activities are conducted on public lands, or when control activities can be detrimental to other portions of the environment or pose a threat to other forms of wildlife, or the safety of man, they should be conducted by skilled professionals to achieve the necessary results and yet minimize the possible adverse effect upon non-target species.

Now, let me turn to a few statements of policy. There are two fundamental points I want to stress: First, animal control will be undertaken as one of several management tools to accomplish a broader goal. Second, we will place increasing reliance upon other resource management agencies, landowners, industry, health officials, and others in developing management plans which may require some form of animal control.

In other words, it is not solely the responsibility or prerogative of this Bureau to determine when and where control is necessary. This determination must be made in cooperation with others, relying on their specific competence as plans are made to manage rangelands, to protect human health, and to prevent damage to urban or industrial facilities. Animal control is a service function that will be available when it is needed to accomplish planned projects.

Within this context, animal control will be performed to serve four major objectives: public health and safety, resource management, agricultural production, and industrial and urban services.

Animal control is a management technique or service that can be practiced either directly, on an operational basis, or indirectly on an educational or extension-type basis, by advising landowners and others on safe, efficient and humane techniques that they can practice themselves. It can also be accomplished by working through reputable commercial control firms and through agencies such as the Extension Services of the universities.

Animal control services will be available only upon request, and with full approval of the landowner or operator, elected officials, and responsible land and resources managing agencies. The Bureau will not promote or "sell" any animal control service. However, its personnel will be available to discuss, interpret, and demonstrate various practices.

How lands will be used and managed is a responsibility of the land and resource management agencies. If these managers identify a use that requires a degree of animal control to achieve a planned objective, appropriate control techniques will be applied by the Bureau. By making control available only when the need for control is included in the resource management plan of the appropriate agency, we hope to encourage preparation of long-range resource management plans.

Before new animal control programs are begun, it will be necessary to determine the possible effect on other wildlife species, particularly rare and endangered species.

Of equal importance with control to prevent various types of damage by wildlife will be the development of cultural methods to prevent damage, including construction design, farming, and feeding and grazing techniques. Preventive maintenance has great unrealized potential.

We clearly recognize a need for new and more sophisticated techniques, and we are intensifying our efforts to develop these through research. We should be able to improve our efforts and at the same

time make these more selective. We cannot expect, however, that research results will be accomplished by tomorrow or next month. This work requires time and testing but it is something that we are very actively pursuing. We shall continue to devote major attention to research in this field.

We intend to establish, through independent sources, systems of gathering annual data on losses, damage, and disease on a national scale. The United States Department of Agriculture has already agreed to assist in this effort. State offices will continue to document similar losses. Field spot checking to authenticate reports will be an important part of the data gathering process.

We will encourage competent commercial services when this is appropriate. Where such commercial services are available, the Bureau will advise its constituents of how these might be obtained. This will permit taking better advantage of commercial services and thus free Bureau personnel for work in which there is a greater demand for their professional skills.

I want to point out that, before our new policy is finally adopted, we shall consult with the user groups, including the Wool Growers, other cooperators, major conservation groups, resource management agencies, public health officials, and others.

We find ourselves in a most delicate position. The protectionist groups, on the one hand, feel that we continue to engage in too much control and that we have no intention of making fundamental changes. At the other extreme, some of the user groups are fearful that we intend to phase out the control operation or curtail it so drastically that there will be a serious impact on their income.

Obviously, neither the extreme protectionist groups nor the extreme user groups are correct. We intend, as I have pointed out, to conduct the program in a responsible manner. We don't intend to engage in more control than is needed and by the same token, we plan to discharge our control responsibilities fully.

In our view, this is a time for moderation and for objective thinking. The new Division has been in existence for slightly more than six months. It takes time and effort to bring about fundamental change. What we need now is the time and the chance to bring about the needed changes.

In closing, I would like to leave several thoughts for your consideration:

First, for reasons that I have already explained, animal control activities must be conducted in a manner that is acceptable to an increasing number of our citizens who have legitimate, diverse interests. The plain fact is that any program of government must be in the general public interest and acceptable to a majority of the people or it will soon be scrapped. It is, therefore, in your best interest and it becomes our responsibility to pursue the animal control program in a manner that accomplishes necessary objectives with a minimum adverse impact upon non-target species and the total environment.

It is my frank opinion that, as we re-examine our responsibilities and proposed actions, you, as users of the land, will find it worthwhile to do the same. It has become trite these days to speak of our "image." Nevertheless, your image, as well as ours, can stand improvement. And, images are not tinsel and gloss, but come about as a result of positive actions.

I would suggest also that you review your methods of financing cooperative animal control programs and the relationship you expect with this Bureau. We are charged with the responsibility for supervising animal control activities -- in some cases by legislation, in some by cooperative agreement and in others, at the request of cooperators.

If we are to discharge this supervisory responsibility, we must have the flexibility and authority to do so. We must be able to employ the tools and move the men to meet specific situations. It is an inefficient use of manpower when a cooperative employee is tied to a single county or a group of counties when there may be trouble in a neighboring county or group of counties. With decreased sheep numbers in some areas and increased levies to finance animal control, it is incumbent upon the cooperator, as well as the Bureau, to make the most efficient use of every tool at our disposal.

In some States, our hands are virtually tied. I suggest that it would be in your best interest to re-examine your funding procedures so that we can give you value received for every dollar spent. And, if we are to supervise and stand responsible to the citizens of this Nation and to the Congress, we must, in fact, have the responsibility for that supervision. I am sure you know what I mean.

Before closing, I want to express a personal view, especially as it relates to animal control and the relationships we enjoy with you -- one of many groups of land users.

I want you to know that I appreciate and understand the problems of the West -- that I am familiar with the needs of the livestock industry as well as of the great recreational demands that are being placed on public lands.



It is my intent that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife discharges its responsibility to its many publics, including the livestock industry, and that we pursue our animal control responsibilities with scientific finesse and with full consideration for other resources. There is no intent on my part to preside over the dismantling of an important resource management tool, namely, that of animal control. Instead, I want the job done better, more effectively, when and where needed. And, you have my pledge that this is the direction in which we intend to move.

x x x